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1. **Introduction**

The objective of the program is to strengthen the governance and policy framework that supports the implementation of the LCDS, fostering enhancements of the regulatory, institutional and monitoring structures to support it. The operation will be organized in four components: (i) macro-economic stability; (ii) regulatory framework: (iii) institutional strengthening; and (iv) Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) system.

This Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (M&E Plan) aims at defining the mechanisms through which to monitor and evaluate progress, performance and achievements of the program goals, to enable timely identification of deviations, implementation of corresponding modifications, and the continuous improvement of strategies and activities. The program will meet the standard monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements and procedures of the IDB.

The proposed monitoring and evaluation system is composed of two elements: (a) monitoring of progress, and (b) evaluation of performance and achievement of targets.

1. **Monitoring Plan**

**Monitoring Responsibilities.** The program will be monitored by the Government of Guyana (GOG), through the Ministry of Finance (MOF), with technical support from the project team. The MOF and the project team will hold several meetings in order to review the progress achieved in implementing the Program and on the fulfillment of the conditions defined as triggers for the subsequent operations, as reflected in the Policy Matrix. For these meetings, the Borrower will furnish, prior to each meeting, information and documentation requested by the Bank regarding the advancement of the program. The meetings will focus on:

1. verifying the degree of compliance with the indicators for the program and its components, as indicated in the Results Matrix and Policy Matrix;
2. taking stock of the successes and shortcomings of program design and execution and its effectiveness in working toward the country’s development objectives; and;
3. recommending corrective or monitoring measures for the second operation of the programmatic series.

**Monitoring Instruments.** IDB has several monitoring systems in place, including the Progress Monitoring Report (PMR)[[1]](#footnote-1) and Loan Management System (LMS). These monitoring systems cover two aspects: fiduciary and technical. Since this is operation is a Policy-based loan (PBL), no procurement and financial management issues will be monitored, and the technical aspects will focus on the attainment of project outcomes and outputs indicators.

**Indicators.** The Results Matrix comprises the program’s indicators. Program indicators have been selected to represent the essential activities within the project scope and are in line with the principles of SMART[[2]](#footnote-2) indicators. In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the project, this M&E Plan includes indicators which monitor program performance and achievements at three levels: impact, outcomes and outputs.

* Impact indicator refers to the Annual Deforestation Rate which is required to be sustained in order to access REDD+ funds which, in turn, finance the implementation of the LCDS.
* The outcomes which this operation aims to achieve are: (i) Policy and regulatory framework enhanced; (ii) Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment strengthened by implementing its strategic plan; (iii) Monitoring, Reporting and Verification system operative.
* Finally, the outputs relate to the specific policy conditions which are included in the Policy Matrix of the PBP.

This indicators as well as the source of data to be used as means of verification for each indicator is indicated in the Results Matrix (Table 1). The MOF, with the support of the Sector Agencies, will be responsible for the activities related to gathering the reports and administrative records generated by the GOG and reporting program results.

**Monitoring Plan Schedule.** Besides regular monitoring activities of GOG,IDB staff will travel to Guyana annually to gather information for the monitoring plan. The first trip is estimated for the second quarter in 2014 and the second in the third quarter 2015. The main users of the information generated will be the GOG, specifically the MOF and the MNRE, and the Bank.

**Monitoring Plan Budget.** The team will evaluate the achievement of the objectives of the program, using as a reference the targets and indicators set in the Results Matrix. Monitoring of the goals will be carried out by the project team with input from an independent consultant (see draft Terms of Reference in Annex I). It will be financed with budget for the preparation of the last operation of the programmatic series.

It is estimated that a budget of US$24,000 will be needed to cover the travel of IDB Staff to Guyana. This will include at least two trips for two specialists.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Unit Cost** | **#** | **Total Cost** |
| Travel and per diem | $6,000 | 4 | $24,000 |
| **Total** |  |  | **$24,000** |

TAble 1: Results Framework

**Matrix of Indicators**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Impact & Results** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target (2016)** | **Verification Means** |
| Impact: Annual deforestation rate: 0.056% sustained | | | | |
| Results:  Governance and policy framework that support the implementation of the LCDS strengthened and its sustainability improved | * Policy and regulatory framework enhanced | * LCDS version 2010 * Limited environment regulations for extractive industries | * LCDS 2013 update * Environment regulations for extractive industries reviewed/approved | * Press release * Reports |
| * MNRE strengthened by implementing its strategic plan | * MNRE does not have a strategic plan | * MNRE strategic plan approved and implemented | * Document of Strategic Plan * Reports on progress |
| * MRVS operative | * MRVS in start-up phase | * MRVS issues carbon impact, carbon stratification & carbon expansion assessments | * Reports of MRVS |

**COMPONENT RESULTS & INDICATORS**

| **Component** | **Indicators** | **Baseline**  **2013** | **Targets** | | | | | **Verification Means** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | |
| 1. **Macro-economic stability** | **Result 1: Continued macro-economic stability** | | | | | | | |
|  | Technical opinion IMA | Stable macro-economic framework | Continued | Continued | Continued | Continued | IMA annual report | |
| 1. **Regulatory framework** | **Result 2: LCDS implemented** | | | | | | | |
|  | LCDS update process completion | Draft | 1 update  2 GRIF projects starting implementation |  | 2 new GRIF projects defined and starting preparation or approved |  | | Press releases |
| Consultations on LCDS and reviews by MSSC | 0 | 1 MSSC meeting took place | 1 MSSC meeting took place | 1 MSSC meeting minutes approving REDD+ Stakeholders Awareness Plan |  | | Minutes of MSSC meeting |
| **Result 3: Forestry & Mining sector have improved environmental management and law enforcement** | | | | | | | |
| Review and application of environmental regulatory framework for extractive industries | EPA has limited regulatory framework to assume overarching responsibilities for environmental compliance  Forestry Act is current; most forest regulations up to date | 1 Review  1 Scoping study |  | EPA strengthened through:   * more solid financial base * more complete package of regulations * operating Compliance and Enforcement Unit   Amendments or regulations ensure consistency between mining, lands surveyors and protected areas  regulations and MNRE mandate  1 Opt-In proposal complete  1 National Land Use Plan complete | Access & Benefit Sharing (ABS) regulations approved and in force  1 Opt In system in place, as approved by Stakeholders  3 Regional Land Use Plans approved and preparing for implementation | | Reports by MNRE containing copies of approved regulations and other measures  Consultant report  Copy of documents approving Plans |
| Operational market-based mechanisms | Initial approach to Extractive Industries Initiative (EITI) | 1 country pre-candidacy for EITI  Code of Practice for Timber Harvesting into force | Code of Practice applied in 50% of concessions | Implementation Plan for Codes of Practice in force  Drafted Code of Practice for Mercury Use | Code of Practice applied to 100% of forestry concessions | | Press release setting up EITI Multi-Stakeholder group  Approval documents submitted by MNRE/GFC  Approval documents submitted by MNRE/GGMC |
| 1 report on technological improvements for extractive sector |  |  |  | | Letter by the Minister of NRE attesting to the receipt of the study. |
| 1. **Institutional strengthening** | **Result 4:** **MNRE has a Strategic Plan that provides for adequate inter-agency coordination and oversight to accomplish LCDS objectives** | | | | | | | |
|  | Strategic Plan detailing adjustments to: (i) create Planning & Policy Unit; (ii) create Coordination Unit to cover existing agencies under MNRE; (iii) create mechanisms for effective coordination between extractive sector-related agencies | Draft | 1 Strategic Plan submitted | 1 Strategic Plan approved | Strategic Plan implemented: (a) M&E Framework; (b) GIS Policy to improve coordination among NR agencies | Strategic Plan implemented: (a) indigenous issues identified and approached institutionally | | Record of formal submission of Strategic Plan to Minister of MNRE  Technical reports |
| Adoption of knowledge-based mechanisms to improve environmental management of forest-based sector | 0 | 1 training program on best-practices for mining  1 design of courses on EIA  1 draft National Log Tracking System | 1 Log Tracking System approved | National Action Plan for Mercury Abatement in force  2 training programs on mercury reduction in mining implemented | Mercury Free Development Fund receives at least one tender | | Technical reports  Records from MNRE/GFC  Reports from MNRE/GGMC  Report from MNRE/GGMC |
| 1. **MRVS** | **Result 5: MRVS capable of generating country-wide, verified reports on forest cover and deforestation drivers** | | | | | | | |
|  | Tools for Carbon Impact Assessment for main drivers developed, and Forest Cover database prepared | 0 | 1 Carbon Impact Assessment tool for main drivers approved  Report on forest area changes 2011-2012; Assessment report on forest carbon stratification; Report on carbon conversion and extraction | 1 report following up progress towards reduced deforestation and forest degradation | Forest carbon emissions and removals with IPCC guidance reported consistently | Integration of forest cover data from all MNRE agencies (Geonode Server operational)  Forest degradation information integrated within MRVS | | Record of decision of approvals by MNRE/GFC  Technical report  Technical report |

1. **Evaluation Plan**

The main objective of the Evaluation Plan is to determine whether the interventions and policy reforms supported by the Program successfully achieved its expected results. Two types of Evaluation could be distinguished, depending on the level of results to be assessed: (i) Final Evaluation, when evaluating the effects of the intervention at the outcome level, that is Policy and regulatory framework enhanced; Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment strengthened by implementing its strategic plan; Monitoring, Reporting and Verification system operative; and (ii) Impact Evaluation, when assessing the effects of the policy reforms at the impact level, that is in sustaining an Annual deforestation rate of 0.056%. Result indicators for each program component are included in the Results Matrix (see [Table](PCDOCS://IDBDOCS/36368840/R) 1).

**Evaluation Plan Responsibility.** The Evaluation Reports, whether Final Evaluation or Impact Evaluation, will be conducted by an individual consultant (see draft Terms of Reference in Annex I-II). The Final Evaluation for PBL-1 and PBL-2 will, in turn, provide the basis for the respective Project Completion Report (PCR) prepared by the IDB at the end of the project implementation period. The MOF will be responsible for coordinating with the Sector Agencies in order to provide the required information for the evaluation of the project.

**Evaluation Plan Methodology.** The Borrower and the Project Team agree that the most appropriate evaluation for this programmatic series, comprised by two Policy Based Loans (PBL), is the method of reflective evaluation, which compares the indicators baseline (before and after), without attributing the ex post results to the specific intervention of the project. [[3]](#footnote-3) This type of evaluation is recommended for programs that involve complex, long-term reforms as they capture not only quantitative, but also qualitative changes. This will provide critical information regarding what works and doesn’t work, as well as lessons learned that will be useful for future projects. This evaluation methodology will try to establish how successful the program was by thinking about the answers to the questions the program’s stakeholders ask themselves. The additionally of this type of evaluation methodology is that the ex-post impact evaluation of the project will produce evidence to close knowledge gaps in the sector that were identified in the project document and/or in the evaluation plan.

The consultant will assess compliance with the policy goals and their sustainability over time, as well as the output targets included in the Program’s Results Matrix. The means of verification (MOVs) matrix will be the source of information that determines compliance with the policy goals. For the purpose of conducting the evaluation, the consultant will conduct interview with relevant stakeholders, apply surveys to target groups, and use previous assessments as reference material.

**Main Evaluation Questions.** The following questions will be used by the consultant to guide the evaluation process.

1. Has the LCDS been further updated? If so, have the changes introduced followed along the same conceptual lines as the 2013 version, used as basis for the loan operation?
2. Have the participation and consultation processes to which the LCDS have been subject resulted in some changes in the orientation of the Strategy, so as to accommodate the opinions and perspective of those consulted?
3. Do Amerindian organizations feel they have been listened to and have had substantive participation in the design and implementation of the LCDS?
4. Do the personnel in decision-making positions at MNRE believe the Ministry has been strengthened and is currently able to perform its coordination functions effectively?
5. Have the GFC, GGMC and EPA adopted clear environmental guidelines for the forestry and mining sectors, directed towards reducing deforestation and forest degradation?
6. Have the GFC and GGMC (and EPA, when appropriate) been able to enforce the new regulations? What have been major obstacles, or major progresses attained?
7. Is the MRVS system operational and widely used by GoG agencies to track changes in forest cover?
8. Has the Government of Norway approved the remainder of funds committed under the MoU with the GoG? Completely or partially? Which factors or reasons have affected this outcome?

**Evaluation Plan Schedule.** The Final Evaluation for PBP-1 and PBP-2 is expected to be conducted in the third quarter of 2015 (six month after last disbursement of PBP 2); while the Impact Evaluation is expected to be conducted in 2017, that is two years after last disbursement of PBP-2.

* 1. **Evaluation Plan Budget.** The total cost of the consultancy should not exceed USD $ 49.940, including all travel and other expenses incurred by the consultants.

Table 1: Evaluation Plan Budget

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Unit Cost** | **#** | **Total Cost** |
| **Final Evaluation Cost** |  |  | **U$S 24.970** |
| Consultant fee | 600 | 30 days |  |
| Travel costs | 2.500 | 1 |  |
| Per diem (days in Georgetown -GY) | 210 | 7 days |  |
| Unexpected costs | 3.000 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Impact Evaluation Cost** |  |  | **U$S 24.970** |
| Consultant fee | 600 | 30 days |  |
| Travel cost | 2.500 | 1 |  |
| Per diem (days in Georgetown- GY) | 210 | 7 days |  |
| Unexpected costs | 3.000 |  |  |
| **Total** |  |  | **U$S 49.940** |

**ANNEX I**

**FINAL EVALUATION CONSULTANCY**

**FINAL EVALUATION CONSULTANCY - TERMS OF REFERENCE**

* + 1. **BACKGROUND**

Guyana took historical initiative when it assigned environmental sustainability a central place in its development program through the 2010 adoption of the Low Carbon Development Strategy (LCDS). Along those lines, this Environmental Capacity Building Program I supports the objective of the GoG to sustain economic growth while creating appropriate conditions to promote new favorable investments in sustainability for its natural resources.

The operation is organized based on 4 components that function in a coordinated and synergistic fashion: (i) macroeconomic stability, (ii) regulatory framework: (iii) institutional strengthening and (iv) monitoring, reporting and verification system. The above are focused on reinforcing institutional capacity to manage natural resources in a way that supports effective LCDS implementation and complies with international standards for ecological sustainability.

* + 1. Consultation Objectives

The objective of this consultation is to carry out a Final Evaluation of the Environmental Capacity Building Program I and II, per the requirements of the Bank.

The following are the general objectives of the consultation:

1. Carry out the Final Evaluation of the Impact of the Environmental Capacity Building Program I and II.

Therefore, the specific objectives of the consultation include the following:

1. Cover the requirements of the model IDB Project Completion Report (PCR)[[4]](#footnote-4), including the joint report on both phases of the PBP, focusing on: (i) Design of the Programmatic Series, (ii) Efficiency and Effectiveness, (iii) Achievements and (iv) Lessons Learned.

The following are the supplemental objectives:

1. Identify the preliminary impacts observed on the reformulation of the productive model in Guyana, with an emphasis on the mining and forestry sectors.
2. Estimate observed effects on the sustainability of forest resources.
3. Evaluate the degree of success enjoyed by the REDD+ mechanism that can be reproduced in other sites and/or with other beneficiaries.

While the core idea is the review of the selected indicators, this should be supplemented by an analysis of information from secondary sources for the purposes of a constructive discussion in terms of causality relationships for the observable behavior of relevant variables related to the economy and the sectors of interest (mining and forestry).

* + 1. **METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS**

The carry out the Final Evaluation, the consultant should take the following methodological aspects into consideration:

1. List the objectives of the Program, as well as the objectives it aimed to address, in accordance with the guidelines for its creation.
2. Identify the principal findings resulting from the implementation of this Program. To that end, the following is a guide with the questions to be answered (the consultant should not only address these issues if, in his/her judgement, there are other relevant items):
3. Was the LCDS updated after 2013? If yes, identify the changes made and establish if they follow the prior conceptual lines used as a reference for the PBP. Should there be changes, explain how they affected or could affect the impacts of the PBP.
4. Has the community consultation process been effective in terms of generating changes in terms of strategy orientation or instrumentation processes? How were the opinions and requests of the groups consulted addressed? What evidence is there of this process?
5. Do the Amerindian Organizations feel like their opinions have been heard and that they have had a recognized role in the design and implementation of the LCDS?
6. What is the opinion of the personnel in charge of the MNRE with regard to MNRE strengthening? Were the activities to coordinate the forestry sectors carried out as efficiently as possible?
7. Have the GFC, GGMC and EPA institutions adopted clear and formal guidelines with regard to environmental management for the mining and forestry sectors that clearly focus on the objectives of reducing deforestation and degradation?
8. Were the GFC, GGMC and EPA institutions capable of controlling compliance with the new regulatory frameworks put in place? What were the greatest obstacles for this process? What were the most outstanding progresses?
9. Is the MRVS being used by the other GoG agencies as a tool to evaluate changes in forest coverage and to set sector strategies?
10. Has the government of Norway approved the transfer of resources in accordance with the conditions established in the MoU? Did they receive the expected sums or a lesser amount? What were the factors influencing the level of disbursements that were effectively completed?

Verify the progress of the Impact and Results Indicators. This includes all the impact and results indicators in the Results Matrix that were used when this intervention was approved. For each, the following will be completed:

* A detailed description.
* An explicit reference to the source or means of verification used.

**II. ACTIVITIES**

1. In direct coordination with sector specialists, review the documentation for the execution of the two operations of the program. In particular, assess the scope and impact achieved according to the targets and indicators in the Policy Matrix and the Results Matrix.
2. In direct coordination with sector specialists, meet with major stakeholders (IDB, GOG and NGOs) to obtain lessons learned (successes and shortcomings) from the design and execution of PBP.
3. Review documentation of the implementing agencies and other stakeholders to complete the required information for the preparation of PCR.

**III. EXPECTED OUTPUTS**

* + - 1. Draft Final Evaluation Report, including all areas specified in the format (text and graphics), with special emphasis on the project results and lessons learned from PBL-1 and 2. This will be reviewed and commented by the GOG and the Bank team.
      2. Final Evaluation Report, addressing previous comments.

**IV. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CONSULTANCY**

1. Consultancy type: Individual.
2. Duration: from the signing of the contract for a period of 30 non-consecutive days.
3. Place of work: Place of residence (23 days) and Guyana (7 days).
4. Qualifications: The consultant must have an advanced degree in Economics, Public Policy or a related field and at least 8 years of experience working in the preparation and monitoring of projects in the public sector. Fluency in English required.
5. Payment: the consultant will be paid in the following manner: (i) A first payment of 20% of the contract amount 15 days after signing it; (ii) A second payment 40% upon delivery and acceptance by the Bank of the Draft Evaluation Report; (iii) A third payment 40% upon delivery and acceptance by the Bank of the Final Evaluation Report.
6. Budget: the total cost of the consultancy should not exceed US $ 25,000, including all travel and other expenses incurred by the consultant.

**V. SCHEDULE**

The consultant will be responsible for delivering the following products within the time framework described below.

1. Draft of Final Evaluation Report detailed in 3.a approved by the Team Leader by 60 after signature of Contract.
2. Final Evaluation report detailed in 3.b approved by the Team Leader by 90 days after signature of Contract.

**VI. SUPERVISION**

The consultancy will be coordinated by Helena Landazuri de Piaggesi, (INE/RND), Team Leader of the operation.

**ANNEX II**

**IMPACT EVALUATION CONSULTANCY**

**ENVIRONMENT SECTOR STRENGTHENING – I and-II (GY-L1039 and GY-L1043)**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

1. Background

Guyana took historical initiative when it assigned environmental sustainability a central place in its development program through the 2010 adoption of the Low Carbon Development Strategy (LCDS). Along those lines, the Environmental Capacity Building Program I supports the objective of the GoG to sustain economic growth while creating appropriate conditions to promote new favorable investments in sustainability for its natural resources.

The operation is organized based on 4 components that function in a coordinated and synergistic fashion: (i) macroeconomic stability, (ii) regulatory framework: (iii) institutional strengthening and (iv) monitoring, reporting and verification system. The above are focused on reinforcing institutional capacity to manage natural resources in a way that supports effective LCDS implementation and complies with international standards for ecological sustainability.

1. Objectives of the consultation

The objective of this consultation is to carry out an Impact Evaluation for the Environmental Capacity Building Program I and II, per the requirements of the Bank.

The following are the general objectives of the consultation:

1. Carry out the Program Impact Evaluation following the established methodology. To this end, a decision was made to apply the reflexive study mechanism (Reflexive Evaluation), which consists of a comparison of the indicators established in the baseline with those arising ex post, without specifically allocating responsibility for the results found.

The specific objectives of the consultation include the following aspects to measure its effectiveness:

1. Identify the impacts and results on the reformulation of the productive model in Guyana, with an emphasis on the mining and forestry sectors.
2. Evaluate impacts on forest resource sustainability.
3. Evaluate the degree of success enjoyed by the REDD+ mechanism that can be reproduced in other sites and/or with other beneficiaries.

While the core idea is the review of the selected indicators, this should be supplemented by an analysis of information from secondary sources for the purposes of a constructive discussion in terms of causality relationships for the observable behavior of relevant variables related to the economy and the sectors of interest (mining and forestry).

1. Methodological Aspects

The carry out the impact evaluation, the consultant should take the following methodological aspects into consideration:

1. List the objectives set out by the Program, as well as the questions that need to be answered through the Impact Evaluation, in accordance with the guidelines for its Formulation.

The following is a guide with the questions to be answered (the consultant should not only address these issues if, in his/her judgement, there are other relevant items):

1. Was the LCDS updated after 2013? If yes, identify the changes made and establish if they follow the prior conceptual lines used as a reference for the PBP. Should there be changes, explain how they affected or could affect the impacts of the PBP.
2. Has the community consultation process been effective in terms of generating changes in terms of strategy orientation or instrumentation processes? How were the opinions and requests of the groups consulted addressed? What evidence is there of this process?
3. Do the Amerindian Organizations feel like their opinions have been heard and that they have had a recognized role in the design and implementation of the LCDS?
4. What is the opinion of the personnel in charge of the MNRE with regard to MNRE strengthening? . Were the activities to coordinate the forestry sectors carried out as efficiently as possible?
5. Have the GFC, GGMC and EPA institutions adopted clear and formal guidelines with regard to environmental management for the mining and forestry sectors that clearly focus on the objectives of reducing deforestation and degradation?
6. Were the GFC, GGMC and EPA institutions capable of controlling compliance with the new regulatory frameworks put in place? What were the greatest obstacles for this process? What were the most outstanding progresses?
7. Is the MRVS being used by the other GoG agencies as a tool to evaluate changes in forest coverage and to set sector strategies?
8. Has the government of Norway approved the transfer of resources in accordance with the conditions established in the MoU? Did they receive the expected sums or a lesser amount? What were the factors influencing the level of disbursements that were effectively completed?

Verify the progress of the Impact and Results Indicators. This includes all the impact and results indicators in the Results Matrix that were used when this intervention was approved. For each, the following will be completed:

* A detailed description.
* A reference to the source of the information or means of verification.

1. Submit detailed information on the indicators from the Matrix of Results found in the Annex, describing them at: (a) the start date of the Program or the date set as the baseline, (b) the date set as the close out for the purposes of this Impact Evaluation, (c) the intermediate dates that were established based on the measurement frequency assigned to each indicator.
2. Present an analytical study of the impacts observed, explaining the reasons for the completion level given for each of the indicators. This study will focus on the mining and forestry sectors, given the objectives of the intervention.
3. Activities

In order to complete this objective, the Consultant will carry out the following activities, among others:

* Review existing documentation on the history of IDB interventions in Guyana and the Country Strategy objectives.
* Review pertinent documentation on the creation of the Program, especially those related to the Impact Evaluation, Monitoring and Follow-up Plan and Ex Ante Economic Evaluation.
* Apply the Bank's Methodological Guide for carrying out Impact Evaluations.

1. Implementation Date.

In order to obtain an appropriate perception of impacts, the Impact Evaluation should be carried out at least two years after close out of the Program. Therefore, it is estimated that the same should be carried out during the first quarter of 2017.

1. Reports and Products

As a result of his/her activities, the consultant should prepare and present, to the satisfaction of the Bank, the following reports:

* A Draft of the Final Report containing the Impact Evaluation, to be presented within 60 days of hiring.
* A Final Report containing the Impact Evaluation, to be presented within 90 days of hiring.

1. Compensation and Method of Payment

The total cost of the consultation will be 30 days of fees.

Payment: the consultant will be paid in the following manner:

1. A first payment of 20% of the contract amount 15 days after signing it;
2. A second payment 40% upon delivery and acceptance by the Bank of the Draft Impact Evaluation Report;
3. A third payment 40% upon delivery and acceptance by the Bank of the Final Impact Evaluation Report.
4. Characteristics of the Consultation

* Category: International Consulting
* Duration: The consultation will last 30 non-consecutive business days.
* Place of work: Georgetown, Guyana (5 days) and the consultant's office (25 days).
* Consultant Qualifications: The consultant should be an Economist, preferably with Master's level specialization studies and more than five years' experience in carrying out similar studies in the area of agricultural management and rural development, with proven international experience in similar programs.
* Languages: The consultant should be able to speak and write English fluidly.
* Budget: the total cost of the consultancy should not exceed US $ 25.000, including all travel and other expenses incurred by the consultant.

1. SUPERVISION

* The consultancy will be coordinated by Helena Landazuri de Piaggesi, (INE/RND), Team Leader of the operation.

1. PMR format specific for PBL to be applied. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. SMART Indicators are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time bound. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Even though the literature recommends the construction of a counterfactual to conduct impact assessments, this is not possible in the specific Project given the national level of the intervention and its extremely unique characteristics worldwide. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. In order to meet the analysis requirements of the IDB criteria, the document should follow the guidelines provided by the IDB, using the required forms to include the information and content required by the same. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)